



**ERIC GIBSON**  
INTERIM DIRECTOR

## County of San Diego

### DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666  
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960  
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017

June 26, 2008

#### **CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)**

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:  
  
Landstedt 4-Lot Minor Subdivision/TPM 21026/ER 06-14-034
2. Lead agency name and address:  
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use  
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,  
San Diego, CA 92123-1666
3.
  - a. Contact Valerie Walsh, Project Manager
  - b. Phone number: (858) 694-2069
  - c. E-mail: Valerie.Walsh@sdcounty.ca.gov.
4. Project location:  
  
2245 Tavern Road, Alpine CA 91903, San Diego County (APN 404-400-20)  
Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1254, Grid A/1
5. Project Applicant name and address:  
  
May Engineering & Surveying, Inc.  
9880 North Magnolia Ave, Suite 205  
Santee, CA 92071
6. General Plan Designation  
Community Plan: Alpine  
Land Use Designation: Residential/1  
Density: 1 du/1, 2, 4 acre(s)

7. Zoning  
Use Regulation: A70  
Minimum Lot Size: 1 acre(s)  
Special Area Regulation: --

8. Description of project:

The project is a Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) to subdivide a 6.45 acre parcel into four (4) lots. The proposed lots range in size from 1.07 to 2.11 acres. Proposed Parcel 1 (1.26 acres) contains an existing 3 bedroom guest house that would be retained. Proposed Parcel 2 (1.07 acres) contains an existing 4 bedroom single-family residence that would also be retained. Proposed Parcel 3 (2.11 acres) is vacant. Proposed Parcel 4 (2.01 acres) is vacant. Proposed Parcels 3 and 4 have the potential each to support a future 3 bedroom single-family residence.

The project site is located at 2245 Tavern Road in the Alpine Community Planning Group, within unincorporated San Diego County. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category CRDA (Country Residential Development Area), Land Use Designation Residential(1) with density of 1 dwelling unit per 1, 2 or 4 acre(s). Zoning for the site is A70.

Access to the site would be provided by a proposed private road, "Boulder Pass Road," that would connect to Tavern Road. Boulder Pass Road would have a width of 24 feet and a "hammerhead" turnaround area to accommodate emergency access. Proposed grading would consist of the cut and fill of 5,000 cubic yards of material.

Public services would be provided by the Padre Dam Municipal Water District, Alpine Fire Protection District, Alpine Union Elementary District, and Grossmont Union High School District. Elementary, middle and high schools are located within five miles of the proposed project site. A fire station is located 1.5 miles south of the proposed project site. Wastewater service would be provided by individual septic systems on each of the proposed four lots.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

Lands surrounding the project site include undeveloped land to the immediate east and residential development to the north, west, and south. The topography of the project site and adjacent land ranges from 1,875 feet above mean sea level (MSL) to 1,975 above MSL. The average slope is less than 25% grade. The site is located 1.3 miles south of Interstate 8.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
Tentative Parcel Map	County of San Diego
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Septic Tank Permit	County of San Diego
Water District Approval	Padre Dam Water District
Fire District Approval	Alpine Fire District

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Aesthetics</a>                      | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Agricultural Resources</a>                        | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Air Quality</a>                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Biological Resources</a> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Cultural Resources</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Geology &amp; Soils</a>               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hazards &amp; Haz. Materials</a>    | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Land Use &amp; Planning</a>           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mineral Resources</a>               | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Noise</a>   | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Population &amp; Housing</a>          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Public Services</a>                 | <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Recreation</a>                                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Transportation/Traffic</a> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Utilities &amp; Service Systems</a> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <a href="#">Mandatory Findings of Significance</a> |  |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)  
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Valerie Walsh  
Printed Name

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Land Use/Environmental Planner  
Title

## **INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

### **I. AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

**No Impact:** The project site, located in Alpine, is 1.3 miles south of Interstate 8 and not visible from the highway. Based on a site visit by County staff on July 5, 2007 the proposed project is not located near or within, or visible from, a scenic vista and would not substantially change the composition of an existing scenic vista in a way that would adversely alter the visual quality or character of the view. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and would not contribute to a cumulative impact because the project site is visible by surrounding neighbors and is largely obscured by terrain and vegetation. Therefore, the project would not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic. Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

**No Impact:** Based on a site visit completed by County staff on July 5, 2007 the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and would not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. The site is located 1.3 miles south of Interstate 8 and is not visible from the highway. Furthermore, the proposed project would not remove visual resources as all existing uses would remain onsite. Potential future residential development on the site would be visually consistent with the area as there are residential uses located to the north, west, and south of the site. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers.

The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding area can be characterized as primarily 0.5 acre to 5.5 acre lots developed with residential dwelling units and accessory buildings. The proposed project is a TPM to divide a 6.45-acre parcel into four discrete lots ranging in size from 1.07 to 2.11 acres. The size of the proposed lots would be consistent with those in the surrounding area. Therefore, the visual impact resulting from an increase in density would be less than significant. Furthermore, as residential uses are located in the immediate vicinity to the north, west and south of the site, any future residential development resulting from the proposed TPM would be visually consistent with the surrounding area. At a maximum, the proposed TPM would result in the potential future development of two single-family homes. Grading associated with this potential future development would not result in

significant changes to the site's existing topography. Therefore, the existing visual quality of the site would not be substantially altered and potential direct impacts to the visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings would be less than significant.

Finally, the project would not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and would not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: (1) The project would comply with the anticipated residential use of the property as designed by both the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, (2) the current residential use and intended future residential use of the site is consistent with existing surrounding residential uses, and (3) the existing topography of the site would not require excessive grading that would significantly change the form of the landscape. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project proposes the residential subdivision of a 6.45 acre parcel into four smaller parcels. Future development on two of the proposed parcels may include outdoor lighting. However, any future outdoor lighting pursuant to the project would be required to meet the requirements of the County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Section 6322-6326) and the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115). Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

The project would not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project would conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Light Pollution Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources of light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore,

compliance with the Code would ensure that the project would not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project and cumulative level.

## **II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site has land designated as Farmlands of Local Importance according to the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). However, based on a site visit by County staff on July 5, 2007 and a review of historic aerial photography, there is no evidence of agricultural use on the project site. Before construction of the existing single-family development occurred in 2003, the site supported mature Coastal Sage Scrub and Englemann Oak Woodland habitat. In order to qualify for the Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance designations, land must have been cropped at some time during the four years prior to the last FMMP mapping date. Given the lack of historical agricultural use on the site, the Farmlands of Local Importance designation for this area according to the State is incorrect. The Farmland designation is likely misapplied as a result of the large scale of the Statewide mapping effort which assigns Farmland designations based on aerial photography and limited ground verification. Therefore, due to the lack of historic agricultural use at the project site, the site does not meet the definition of an agricultural resource and no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance to a non-agricultural use would occur as a result of this project.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site is zoned A70, which is considered to be an agricultural zone. However, the proposed project would not result in a conflict in zoning for agricultural use, because the project is a Tentative Parcel Map that would



support the potential future development of two single-family residences. Single-family residences are a permitted use in A70 zones and would not create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, there would be no conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site and surrounding area within a radius of one mile have land designated as Farmlands of Local Importance. The proposed project was reviewed by the Department of Planning and Land Use. It was determined that the project would not have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Farmlands of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use because no agricultural use occurs on the site. In addition, the surrounding area includes existing single family residential uses to the north, west and south of the site. The proposed use would not significantly change the existing land uses in the area or convert agricultural operations to a non-agricultural use. Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use would occur as a result of this project.

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes development that was anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project would not result in emissions of significant quantities of criteria pollutants listed in the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or toxic air contaminants as identified by the California Air Resources Board. As such, the proposed project is

not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the project is consistent with the SANDAG growth projections used in the RAQS and SIP; therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is a TPM proposing a 4-lot subdivision that would potentially involve grading for the development of two future single-family homes. Grading is anticipated to include a balanced cut and fill of 5,000 cubic yards. Grading operations associated with the potential future development would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from grading and construction would be minimal and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. In addition, traffic generated by the project is anticipated to result in 24 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for criteria pollutants. As such, the project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state

ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) under the CAAQS. Ozone is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, and dust from construction.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed Tentative Parcel Map would result in the establishment of two vacant parcels, which in the future may each be developed with a single-family residence. Air quality emissions associated with this potential future development include PM<sub>10</sub>, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOCs from construction/grading activities as well as VOCs resulting from an increase of traffic. Grading operations associated with the construction of the future homes would be subject to the County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. In addition, emissions resulting from the use of construction equipment would be minimal and localized, resulting in PM<sub>10</sub> and VOC emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3. Therefore, emissions resulting from construction and grading would be less than significant. Traffic associated with the proposed project is anticipated to be 24 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the Screening-Level Criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3 for VOCs and PM<sub>10</sub>. Therefore, emissions related to vehicle trips associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

Finally, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project, as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated

with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM<sub>10</sub>, or any O<sub>3</sub> precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12<sup>th</sup> Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The following sensitive receptors have been identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project: Boulder Oaks Elementary School and Joan MacQueen Middle School. However, based on review by County staff, the proposed TPM does not include uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations. In addition, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project, in combination with past, present and future projects within the surrounding area have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by SDAPCD Rule 20.2 and by the SCAQMD CEQA air quality handbook section 6.2 and 6.3.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified in association with the proposed project. As such, no impact from odors is anticipated.

#### **IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Biological surveys were conducted by RC Biological Consulting and summarized in the Biological Letter Report dated January 2008. The site contains 0.36 acre of open Engelmann oak woodland, 0.77 acre of coastal sage scrub, 2.17 acres of disturbed land, and 3.15 acre of developed land.

One sensitive plant species and one sensitive wildlife species were detected during field surveys: Engelmann oak (*Quercus engelmannii*) and turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*). No protocol California gnatcatcher (*Poliioptila californica*) surveys were conducted because the species has a low potential to occur on-site due to the lack of suitable habitat, the presence of surrounding residential development, and an elevation range atypical for this species to occupy. Protocol Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*) surveys were conducted in 2007 and the results were negative.

The project site is located within the Multiple Species Conservation Program boundary (South Metro-Lakeside-Jamul Segment). The 6.45-acre project site was previously issued a Certificate of Inclusion (COI) in 2003, which was modified in July 2005. The modified COI gave legal basis to remove 5.0 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat for the development of a single-family residence, guest house, and fire clearing. The remaining 1.45 acres, which supported coastal sage scrub habitat, was not covered by the COI. Since the COI was issued, legal clearing of the 5.0 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat occurred. However, an additional 0.68 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat was also disturbed. As the additional 0.68 acres of disturbance was not authorized by the COI, it is considered existing coastal sage scrub habitat for the purpose of this CEQA Initial Study. Therefore, the proposed project would potentially impact 1.45 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat (6.45 acres – 5.0 legal clearing), requiring offsite mitigation. No impacts to open Engelmann oak woodland habitat would result from the proposed project because the oaks are retained within the fuel modification zone for the existing residence and have been pruned to fuel management standards and incorporated into the landscaping for the existing homes. Impacts to coastal sage scrub would be mitigated with the off-site purchase of 1.45 acres of Tier II or higher Tier habitat credit located within a Biological Resource Conservation Area (BRCA) in the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). To minimize potential impacts to sensitive avian species, no brushing, clearing or grading would occur during migratory bird breeding season (February 15<sup>th</sup> through August 31<sup>st</sup>) in the coastal sage scrub.

County staff has reviewed the past, present, and probable future projects as listed in Section XVII(b) and has determined that the cumulative loss of Inland coastal sage scrub may cause a significant impact on candidate, sensitive, or special status species. However, this project's contribution to the cumulative habitat loss would be less than

cumulatively considerable upon implementation of the following mitigation measures: Prior to any further habitat impacts, 1.45 acres of Tier II or higher Tier habitat credit shall be purchased within a Biological Resource Conservation Area (BRCA) in the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and reduce this project's contribution to cumulative biological impacts by contributing to the development of large, biologically viable areas that support candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

Staff has determined that although the site supports biological habitat and species, implementation of the mitigation measures described above would ensure that project impacts would not result in substantial adverse effects, or have a cumulatively considerable impact to species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. All potentially significant impacts would be reduced to a level below significant.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** According to the Biological Letter Report from RC Biological Consulting (January 2008), the site contains no riparian habitat. The site does, however, support coastal sage scrub which is recognized as a sensitive natural community by the County of San Diego, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service. The site contains 0.36 acre of open Engelmann oak woodland, 0.77 acre of coastal sage scrub, 2.17 acres of disturbed land, and 3.15 acre of developed land.

The project was previously issued a Certificate of Inclusion (COI) in 2003 (modified July 2005), which allowed for the removal of 5.0 acres of habitat for the existing residence, guest house, and fire clearing. Approximately 2.17 acres of disturbed land occurs on-site. Of this, approximately 1.49 acres was authorized to be cleared by the COI. The remaining 0.68 acre exceeds the impacts authorized by the COI. Therefore, for the purpose of this CEQA Initial Study, 0.68 will be considered coastal sage scrub habitat. Potentially significant impacts to sensitive habitat are estimated to include 1.45 acre of coastal sage scrub habitat (0.77 acre existing + 0.68 acre cleared). No impacts to open Engelmann oak woodland habitat would result from the proposed project because the oaks are retained within the fuel modification zone for the existing residence and have been pruned to fuel management standards and incorporated into the landscaping for the existing homes. Impacts to coastal sage scrub would be mitigated with the off-site purchase of 1.45 acres of Tier II or higher Tier habitat credit located within BRCA in the

MSCP. This mitigation would reduce biological resource impacts to a level below significant.

Therefore, impacts to sensitive natural communities as identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations are considered less than significant through the off-site habitat purchase.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts would occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** The project would impact native vegetation on-site. Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a Biological Letter Report (RC Biological Consulting, January 2008), and a County staff site visit on July 5, 2007, it has been determined that the site's biological value is limited by surrounding residential uses to the north, west, and south. Although the surrounding land to the east is undeveloped lands within a Pre-approved Mitigation Area (PAMA), the existing residence and guest house is located along the eastern perimeter of the property. The only portion of the proposed project site that is undeveloped is the

western portion of the property which is a 0.77 acre island of coastal sage scrub surrounded by development to the west and south and disturbed land to the immediate north and east. In addition, because the property primarily supports existing development and disturbed land, the site has a low potential to support a local or regional wildlife linkage or corridor. Based on the evidence in the record, the site does not have potential to support the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or native wildlife nursery sites.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** According to the Biological Letter Report from RC Biological Consulting (January 2008), the site supports coastal sage scrub which is recognized as a sensitive natural community by the County of San Diego, the California Department of Fish and Game, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

The project was previously issued a Certificate of Inclusion (COI) in 2003 (modified July 2005), which allowed for the removal of 5.0 acres of habitat for the existing residence, guest house, and fire clearing. Approximately 2.17 acres of disturbed land occurs on-site. Of this, approximately 1.49 acres was authorized to be cleared by the COI. The remaining 0.68 acre exceeds the impacts authorized by the COI. Therefore, for the purpose of this CEQA Initial Study, 0.68 will be considered coastal sage scrub habitat. Potentially significant impacts to sensitive habitat are estimated to include 1.45 acre of coastal sage scrub habitat (0.77 acre existing + 0.68 acre cleared). No impacts to open Engelmann oak woodland habitat would result from the proposed project because the oaks are retained within the fuel modification zone for the existing residence and have been pruned to fuel management standards and incorporated into the landscaping for the existing homes. Impacts to coastal sage scrub would be mitigated with the off-site purchase of 1.45 acres of Tier II or higher Tier habitat credit located within BRCA in the MSCP. This mitigation would reduce biological resource impacts to a level below significant.

Therefore, impacts to sensitive natural communities as identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations are considered less than significant through the off-site habitat purchase.



**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on March 29, 2007, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in a historical resources report titled, *"Cultural Resources Survey Report for: TPM 21026, Log No. 06-14-034 – Landstedt Project APN 404-400-20-00; Negative Findings"*, prepared by Gail Wright, dated April 6, 2007.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright on March 29, 2007, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any above-ground archaeological resources. The results of the survey are included in an archaeological survey report titled, *"Cultural Resources Survey Report for: TPM 21026, Log No. 06-14-034 – Landstedt Project APN 404-400-20-00; Negative Findings"*, prepared by Gail Wright, dated April 6, 2007. However, because prehistoric resources have been recorded within one mile of the site, the project may contain buried archaeological resources. Therefore, any future development associated with the TPM would be required to conduct archaeological monitoring during all ground disturbing activities associated with the project. The presence of an archaeological monitor and the implementation of an archaeological monitoring program would reduce potential impacts to buried archaeological resources to a level below significant.

Finally, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted for a listing of tribes in the area that may consider the site as ancestral lands. The response from

NAHC was received November 6, 2007, and a letter was sent to those tribes on November 6, 2006. No responses from the tribes were received.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Unique Paleontological Resources - A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any impacts to unique paleontological resources.

Unique Geologic Features – The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been catalogued within the Conservation Element (Part X) of the County's General Plan or support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. Additionally, based on a site visit by Gail Wright on March 29, 2007 no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any impacts to unique geologic features.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, on March 29, 2007, it has been determined that the project would not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled, *"Cultural Resources Survey Report for: TPM 21026, Log No. 06-14-034 – Landstedt Project APN 404-400-20-00; Negative Findings"*, prepared by Gail Wright, dated April 6, 2007. However, because prehistoric resources have been recorded within one mile of the site, buried archaeological resources, which may include human remains, may occur on the project site. Therefore, any future development associated with the TPM would be required to conduct archaeological monitoring during all ground disturbing activities associated with

the project. The presence of an archaeological monitor and the implementation of an archaeological monitoring program would reduce potential impacts to buried archaeological resources to a level below significant.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS** -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there would be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, any future development associated with the project would be required to conform to the Seismic Requirements outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code would ensure that any future development associated with the proposed TPM would not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. This indicates that the geologic environment of the project site is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there would be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction.

iv. Landslides?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as FeE2 (*Fallbrook Rocky Sandy Loam*) that has a soil erodibility rating of "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project would not result in unprotected erodible soils; would not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and would not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Stormwater Management Plan dated May 31, 2007, as certified by Elliott May of May Engineering and Surveying, Inc. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site: silt fencing, fiber rolls, street sweeping and vacuuming, stockpile management, solid waste management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, desilting basin, gravel bag berm, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, and concrete waste management.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Stormwater Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is a TPM that would create two developable parcels. The potential future development of a maximum two single-family residences would result in site disturbance and grading of an anticipated 5,000 cubic yards of cut and fill. However, the proposed project is consistent with the geological formations underlying the site. The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. On a site visit conducted by County staff on July 5, 2007, no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions as a result of the project. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are FeE2 (*Fallbrook Rocky Sandy Loam*), which have a shrink/swell rating of "Moderate." However the project would not result in significant impacts because the project would be required to comply with the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils. Compliance with the Uniform Building Code standards would ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, the presence of these soils onsite would not create substantial risks to life or property and the impact is less than significant.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project site includes two existing septic systems that serve the existing single-family residence and guest house. In addition, the proposed TPM includes two proposed standard septic systems that would be located west of the housing pads on Proposed Parcels 3 and 4. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on August 7, 2007. Therefore, it has been determined that the proposed project site has soils capable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 6, Div. 8, Chap. 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. Therefore, the impacts resulting from the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are less than significant.

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Potentially Significant Unless  
Mitigation Incorporation

☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite and therefore would not create a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials from demolition activities.

- b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Although the project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing elementary and middle school, the project does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials. Therefore, the project would not have an effect on an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: The State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would



the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP), within a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface, or within two miles of a public airport. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY  
RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan would not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

**No Impact:** The Oil Spill Contingency Element would not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE  
RESPONSE PLAN

**No Impact:** The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan would not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

**No Impact:** The Dam Evacuation Plan would not be interfered with because the project is located outside a dam inundation zone.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project would comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County and Appendix II-A, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards would occur during the Tentative Parcel Map and/or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated June 19, 2006, have been received from the Alpine Fire Protection District. The conditions from the Alpine Fire Protection District include: on-site roadways to have a minimum improved width of 24 feet with a concrete or AC surface, dead-end roadway shall terminate in a hammerhead approved by the Alpine Fire District, access roadway gradient shall not exceed 20 percent, and the minimum radius bend for roadways shall be 30 feet at the curb line (includes driveways). The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be three minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County Public Facilities Element is five minutes. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A and through compliance with the Alpine Fire Protection District's conditions, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are also required to comply with the Consolidated Fire Code and Appendix II-A.

- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that would produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.),

solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by County staff on July 5, 2007, none of these uses are found on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY** -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is a 4-lot minor subdivision. Two vacant parcels would be created that would have the potential each to support a single-family development. A Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects was prepared by Elliott May of May Engineering & Surveying, Inc (May 31, 2007), which demonstrates that the project would comply with all requirements of the San Diego Regional Water Control Board and Watershed Protection Ordinance. The project site proposes and would be required to implement the following site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering stormwater runoff: silt fences, street sweeping and vacuuming, stockpile management, solid water management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, vehicle and equipment maintenance, desilting basins, gravel bag berms, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, permanent landscaping, asphalt concrete/PCC/porous pavement over areas designated as roadways or parking lots, rock slope protection along channel banks, and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls. These measures would enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project would not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project would conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Alpine (907.33) hydrologic sub-basin and the Alpine Heights (909.26) sub-basin within the San Diego hydrologic unit are mapped on the project site. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, a portion of San Diego River watershed at the Pacific Ocean and mouth of the San Diego River is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the San Diego watershed include coliform bacteria, total dissolved solids, nutrients, petroleum chemicals, toxics, and trash.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: soil disturbing activities, asphalt paving including patching, temporary on-site storage of construction materials including mortar mix, raw landscaping and soil stabilization materials, treated lumber, rebar, and plated metal fencing materials, trash generated from the project. However, the following site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs would be employed such that potential pollutants would be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: silt fences, street sweeping and vacuuming, stockpile management, solid water management, stabilized construction entrance/exit, vehicle and equipment maintenance, desilting basins, gravel bag berm, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, concrete waste management, permanent landscaping, asphalt concrete/PCC/porous pavement over areas designated as roadways or parking lots, rock slope protection along channel banks, and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls.

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that would reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and

location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed. As the proposed project would be required to implement the water quality protection measures contained in its Stormwater Management Plan, the impact would be less than significant.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Alpine (907.33) hydrologic sub-basin and the Alpine Heights (909.26) sub-basin within the San Diego hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: Municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; commercial and sport fishing; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

Through the potential development of two vacant parcels created by the proposed TPM, the following potential sources of polluted runoff could occur: construction activities, equipment/materials/product/waste storage and handling areas, and outdoor vehicle repair/washing/fueling activities. However, the following site design measures, source control BMPs and treatment control BMPs would be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: permanent

landscaping; asphalt concrete on disturbed areas designated as roadway or parking lots; and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at storm drain outfalls.

Finally, proposed BMPs in the project's Stormwater Management Plan are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting processes that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting processes.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project would obtain its water supply from the Padre Dam Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. Proposed Parcel 2 includes an existing well that would continue to be used solely for irrigation water on that parcel. Due to the relatively small size of Proposed Parcel 2 (1.07 acres), the amount of groundwater that would be used for household landscape irrigation would be less than significant. In addition, the project would not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, the impact to groundwater resources resulting from the proposed TPM is less than significant.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is a Tentative Parcel Map to create four lots (two vacant and two developed) from a 6.45 acre parcel. As outlined in the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) dated May 31, 2007 and prepared by May Engineering & Surveying, Inc., the project would implement site design measures, source control, and treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering stormwater runoff. These measures would control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that would address equipment operation and materials management, prevent erosion from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works would ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project would not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and would not alter any drainage patterns on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation would be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI, Geology and Soils, Question b.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project would not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons:

- a. Drainage would be designed to flow to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- b. The project would not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.



Moreover, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration of a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project would not substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. Storm water runoff generated by the project is anticipated to be adequately transported offsite through the use of existing storm water drainage facilities and systems.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any known additional sources of polluted runoff. In addition, the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff off-site.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact would occur.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact would occur.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area including a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

- i. SEICHE

**No Impact:** The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

- ii. TSUNAMI

**No Impact:** The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

**No Impact:** Mudflow is a type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, County staff has determined that the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. Although the proposed project could result in land disturbance that would expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project would not introduce new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy CRDA (County Residential Development Area) and General Plan Land Use Designation 1-Residential. The General Plan requires minimum gross parcel sizes of 1 acre and not more than 4 dwelling units per acre. As the TPM proposes one dwelling unit on parcels that are each greater than one acre, the proposed project has gross parcel sizes and density that are consistent with the General Plan. The project is subject to the policies of the Alpine Community Plan and is consistent with that Plan. The current zone is A70, which requires a net minimum lot size of 1 acre. The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance requirements for minimum lot size.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by developed land uses including single-family residential uses to the north, west and south which are incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already become inaccessible due to incompatible land uses.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project site is zoned A70, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan would occur as a result of this project.

**XI. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is a Tentative Parcel Map that would create two vacant parcels each intended for the development of a single-family home. In addition, a single-family residence and guest house are located on the project site. Therefore, residential uses occupied by residents would be present on the project site. Based on a site visit completed by County staff on July 5, 2007, the surrounding area also supports residential uses to the north, west and south. However, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the CNEL 60 dB(A). This is based on County staff's review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dB(A) contours). Therefore, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned A70 that has a one-hour average sound limit of 45 db(A). The adjacent properties are also zoned A70 and have one-hour average sound limit of 45 db(A). Based on review by County staff, the project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards because the project would not include any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.410

The project would not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410). Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. In addition, it is not anticipated that the project would operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404 and 36.410) would ensure that the project would not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts. The project would not exceed the local noise standards for construction, noise sensitive areas, or noise limits at the property boundary. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: vehicles and construction activities. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project would not result in cumulative noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future projects would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project would operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for airports or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

## **XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING** -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated



conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The property currently has a single-family home and guest house, which are to remain. Potentially, the proposed Tentative Parcel Map could result in the future development of two additional single-family dwellings. The new single-family homes would be in addition to those that currently exist on the site. Therefore, the project would not displace existing housing.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The property currently has a single-family home and guest house, which are to remain. Potentially, the proposed Tentative Parcel Map could result in the future development of two additional single-family dwellings. The new single-family homes would be in addition to those that currently exist on the site. Therefore, the project would not displace any people.

### **XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?

- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms were received on June 19, 2006, which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Alpine Fire Protection District, Padre Dam Municipal Water District, Grossmont Union High School District, and Alpine Union General Elementary District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

**XIV. RECREATION**

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project is a Tentative Parcel Map that may result in the potential future development of two single-family residences. Therefore, the project would also result in an incremental increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities, the project would be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation

facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to pay park fees. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication, thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project would not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

There is an existing surplus of County Regional Parks. Currently, there is over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which far exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive surplus of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation, the project would not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project would not result any cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant surplus of regional recreational facilities would remain.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC** -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact :** The proposed project would result in an additional 24 Average Daily Trips (ADT). The project was reviewed by the County of San Diego Department of Public Works and was determined not to result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions for the following reasons: The adjacent roads are operating at a level of service "C" or better. Therefore, the project would not have a significant direct project impact on traffic volume, which is considered substantial in relation to existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that would mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies would be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, would use funds from TansNet, state, and federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The proposed project generates 24 ADT. These trips would be distributed on circulation element roadways in the County that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which

would be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, would mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Master Plan Zone and is not adjacent to any public or private airports; therefore, the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, or place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The Alpine Fire Department has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that there is adequate emergency fire access. Additionally, roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The Zoning Ordinance Section 6758 Parking Schedule requires two on-site parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The proposed lots have sufficient area to provide at least two on-site parking spaces consistent with the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required roadway improvements would be constructed to maintain existing conditions as they relate to pedestrians and bicyclists.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to on-site wastewater systems (OSWS), also known as septic systems. The project involves subdividing a 6.45 acre lot into 4 parcels with individual septic tanks for each. Discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. California Water Code Section 13282 allows RWQCBs to authorize a local public agency to issue permits for OSWS "to ensure that systems are adequately designed, located, sized, spaced, constructed and maintained." The RWQCBs with jurisdiction over San Diego County have authorized the County of San Diego,

Department of Environmental Health (DEH) to issue certain OSWS permits throughout the County and within the incorporated cities. DEH has reviewed the OSWS lay-out for the project pursuant to DEH, Land and Water Quality Division's, "On-site Wastewater Systems: Permitting Process and Design Criteria." DEH approved the project's OSWS on August 7, 2007. Therefore, the project has been found to be consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the project would not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project would include permanent landscaping, rock slope protection along channel banks, and outlet protection/velocity dissipation devices at stormdrain outfalls to control stormwater flow and velocity. Refer to the Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects dated May 31, 2007 for more information. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form Section I-XVII, these improvements would not result in an adverse physical effect on the environment. Specifically, refer to Section VIII for more information.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** The project requires water service from the Padre Dam Municipal Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Padre Dam Water District was received on June 19, 2006, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water demands. Therefore, the project would have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

- e) Wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact         |

Discussion/Explanation:

**No Impact:** The proposed project would rely completely on an on-site wastewater system (septic system); therefore, the project would not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the project would generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.



- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                               |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less than Significant Impact:** Implementation of the project would generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, would comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant that would be potentially impacted by the project include Biological Resources, and specifically, 1.45 acres of Inland coastal sage scrub habitat. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a

level below significant. This mitigation includes the purchase of 1.45 acres of Tier II or higher Tier habitat credit located within a Biological Resource Conservation Area in the Multiple Species Conservation Program. The results of this initial study demonstrate cultural resources would be potentially impacted by the project, specifically underground archaeological resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces this potential impact to below a level of significance. This mitigation includes onsite monitoring and observation by a qualified archaeologist as part of a grading monitoring and data recovery program. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
Mucho TM	TM 5454
Park Alpine TM	TM 5438
Miller TPM	TPM 20586
Smith TPM	TPM 20578
South Grade Road #562	MUP 02-047
Berger Hobby	Administrative Permit – Mod/Dev 00-057-01

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to transportation and traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significant. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF, which will be required prior to the issuance of building permits. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project.

Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact                    |

Discussion/Explanation:

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated:** In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality, XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to transportation and traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to below a level of significance. This mitigation includes payment of the TIF, which will be required prior to the issuance of building permits. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

## **XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov). For County regulation refer to [www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com). All other references are available upon request.

May Engineering & Surveying, Inc. Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects. May 31, 2007.

RC Biological Consulting, Inc. Revised Fire Protection Plan Short Form for Landstedt Minor Subdivision, APN 404-400-20, TPM 21026, in the Community of Alpine. December 19, 2007.

RC Biological Consulting, Inc. Biological Letter Report for Landstedt Minor Subdivision TPM 21026 ER 06-14-034. January 2008.

Wright, Gail. Cultural Resources Survey Report for: TPM 21026, Log no. 06-14-034 – Landstedt Project APN 404-400-20-00 Negative Findings. April 6, 2007.

### **AESTHETICS**

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.  
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.  
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.  
([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design

Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. ([www.intl-light.com](http://www.intl-light.com))

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. ([www.lrc.rpi.edu](http://www.lrc.rpi.edu))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. ([www.blm.gov](http://www.blm.gov))

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

#### AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov), [www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. ([www.qp.gov.bc.ca](http://www.qp.gov.bc.ca))

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. ([www.nrcs.usda.gov](http://www.nrcs.usda.gov), [www.swcs.org](http://www.swcs.org)).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

#### AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. ([www.aqmd.gov](http://www.aqmd.gov))

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. ([www.dfg.ca.gov](http://www.dfg.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5<sup>th</sup> Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. ([www.ceres.ca.gov](http://www.ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program

Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.  
(<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. ([www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. ([endangered.fws.gov](http://endangered.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. ([ecos.fws.gov](http://ecos.fws.gov))

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. ([migratorybirds.fws.gov](http://migratorybirds.fws.gov))

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act

(16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

#### GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. ([soils.usda.gov](http://soils.usda.gov))

#### HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. ([www.dtsc.ca.gov](http://www.dtsc.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))



California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov>, [www.oes.ca.gov](http://www.oes.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, 5121, et seq. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.

Uniform Building Code. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

## **HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**

American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government

California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. ([rubicon.water.ca.gov](http://rubicon.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. ([www.groundwater.water.ca.gov](http://www.groundwater.water.ca.gov))

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. ([www.dpla2.water.ca.gov](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov))

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov), <http://www.amlegal.com>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. ([www.projectcleanwater.org](http://www.projectcleanwater.org))

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov))

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. ([www.swrcb.ca.gov](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov))

## **LAND USE & PLANNING**

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. ([www.consrv.ca.gov](http://www.consrv.ca.gov))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

#### MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

#### NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . ([www.buildersbook.com](http://www.buildersbook.com))

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. ([ceres.ca.gov](http://ceres.ca.gov))

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. ([www.iso.ch](http://www.iso.ch))

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

#### POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. ([www4.law.cornell.edu](http://www4.law.cornell.edu))

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

#### RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. ([www.amlegal.com](http://www.amlegal.com))

#### TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. ([www.dot.ca.gov](http://www.dot.ca.gov))

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). ([www.sandag.org](http://www.sandag.org))

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. ([www.gpoaccess.gov](http://www.gpoaccess.gov))

#### UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. ([ccr.oal.ca.gov](http://ccr.oal.ca.gov))

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. ([www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov))

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. ([www.sdcountry.ca.gov](http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov))

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. ([www.co.san-diego.ca.us](http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us))

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.